

Application Serial No. 10/687,607  
Reply to Office Action dated March 20, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The outstanding Office Action sets forth a restriction requirement between claims 1-16 drawn to a wood door and laminate core used therein versus claims 17-30 drawn to a process for manufacturing the door. The Examiner has held that these claim sets are drawn to distinct inventions because the door can be made by materially different method "such as using another method for forming the grooves in the panels. For example, one may use a chisel to form the grooves."


Initially, it is respectfully submitted that independent method claim 17 is not limited to any particular manner of forming the grooves such that the basis for the rejection is not seen to be relevant. More specifically, claim 17 only recites creating grooves on one side of a first panel and creating grooves on one side of a second panel, with each of the first and second panels being formed from an organic material. Therefore, the broadest method claim does not have any specific manner in which the grooves are formed and can also be formed with a "chisel."

As the basis for the restriction requirement is seen to be inconsistent with the claimed subject matter, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. In order to fully respond to the Office Action, the applicant hereby elects, with traverse, examination of method claims 17-30 in this application. If the Examiner should have any additional questions or concerns regarding this matter, he is cordially

Application Serial No. 10/687,607  
Reply to Office Action dated March 20, 2006

invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below to further expedite  
prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Everett G. Diederiks, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,323

Date: May 18, 2006  
**DIEDERIKS & WHITELAW, PLC**  
12471 Dillingham Square, #301  
Woodbridge, VA 22192  
Tel: (703) 583-8300  
Fax: (703) 583-8301